

MICHIGAN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PREVENTION & TREATMENT BOARD

Child & Family Services / Michigan Family Independence Agency

235 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 506, Lansing, Michigan 48909

Phone: (517) 335-6388 FAX: (517) 241-8903

**MICHIGAN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND
TREATMENT BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

May 10, 2000

Lansing Center

Governor's Room

Lansing, MI

***** APPROVED – June 15, 2000 *****

Attendance:

James A. Fink, Chair
Ferne Farber, DV Board
Shirley Mann Gray, DV Board
Catherine Christ Lucas, DV Board

Debi Cain, Executive Director
Patsy Baker, DV Staff
Celest Colton, DV Staff
Sandy Cory, DV Staff
Sarah Heuser, DV Staff
Joni Lindeman, DV Staff
Linda Marks, DV Staff

Absent:

The Honorable Richard Halloran, DV Board
Michelle Hayes, DV Board
The Honorable Edward Sosnick, DV Board

Guests:

Jim Beougher, Director, FIA Child and Family Services
Jo Bullis, Women's Resource Center of Grand Traverse
Donna Cornwell, Center for Women in Transition
Deb Crandall, BISC-MI
Debbie Felder-Smith, LACASA
Pam Forbes, Women's Information Service
Leslie Hagen, Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan

Ellen Hayse, Michigan State University
Larry Hermen, Centerboard Associates
Peaty Hershberger, Council Against Domestic Assault
Valerie Hoffman, Underground Railroad
Douglas E. Howard, Director, FIA
Doreen Howson, Eastern Upper Peninsula DV Program
Laurie Huff, Turning Point
Char Kangas, Baraga County Shelter Home
Mary Keefe, MI Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence
Sue Kensington, Women's Center
Gail Krieger, MI Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence
Jan Mancinelli, Women's Resource Center of Northern Michigan
Susan McGee, DV Project, Inc./SAFE House
Barbara Mills, YWCA Domestic Assault Program
Shirley Pascal, Aware, Inc.
Mary Patterson, DARES
Marie Peterson, Region Four Community Services
Barbara Rajewski, Bay County Women's Center
Victoria Reese, SAFE Place
Shari Spoelman, Cadillac Area OASIS
Kim Spurlock, LACADA
Ginny Wood, Family Counseling & Services

I. Meeting called to order at 12:30 pm. Introductions were made around the room.

II. Board Consent

A. Approval of Agenda: C. Lucas moved to approve the agenda. S. Mann Gray seconded the motion. Motion carried.

B. Approval of Minutes: C. Lucas moved to approve the MDVPT Board meeting minutes of April 12, 2000. Seconded by S. Mann Gray. Motion carried.

III. General Reports:

A. Chair's Report: J. Fink reported that board members R. Halloran, M. Hayes, and E. Sosnick were unable to attend today's meeting and sent their regrets.

B. Executive Director's Report:

The Summits: D. Cain reported that the MDVPTB is working out the final details with the

Tri-County Coalition which represents Oakland, Macomb and Wayne counties. The coalition will be taking over the responsibility for the coordinating council conference tentatively scheduled for February 2001 in the Lansing or Mt. Pleasant area.

MDVPTB and Training Institute staff will plan the fall 2001 summit with Penny Hackett-Evans as chair. As plans are developed, input will be requested from the board, STOP state partners, domestic violence programs, etc.

C. Other Reports: There were no other reports.

IV. Ends Development:

A. Transitional Supportive Housing (TSH): D. Cain reported on the status of the TSH project. An exception approval was received from D. Howard on extending (through an amendment process) the end date for TSH grants to September 30, 2001. The sixteen programs involved have been very cooperative in relaying needed information to establish the TSH project. Outcomes and evaluation procedures are being pursued as is tightening the working relationship with both MSHDA and HUD. Their expertise in this area has been a valuable tool in our TSH effort.

B. GPS Tethering: D. Cain reported the MDVPTB is waiting to hear from Wayne County as to their progress. Oakland and Otsego counties' projects are moving forward. More activity in Oakland County is expected with the return of B. Hankey. Otsego County reports three pending cases for tethering but these have not been formalized.

The evaluation process with battered women has been concluded. Within the next month, C. Sutherland from Michigan State University will be making personal contacts with battered women from Oakland County retrieving their feedback on the tethering, i.e., how safe she felt, how cumbersome a process it was, and how helpful was this alternative.

V. Ends Development – Education/Discussion: J. Fink explained that a goal of the board is to use the board meetings to encourage representatives from all over the state to attend. This will enable the board's business to be conducted, assist in collecting information for making policy determinations, and continue to have the Ends meet the priorities of the board.

C. Lucas explained the educational process of the board as not only collecting information but being proactive as outlined by the Carver Model. In keeping with this model, the Michigan Coalition Against Domestic & Sexual Violence was requested to convene a panel for today's meeting outlining critical issues from service providers.

M. Keefe, Michigan Coalition Against Domestic & Sexual Violence (MCADSV), introduced

The Emerging and Essential Panel members: S. McGee, Safe House, Ann Arbor; S. Kensington, Women's Center, Marquette; B. Mills, YWCA Domestic Assault Program, Kalamazoo; J. Mancinelli, Women's Resource Center of Northern Michigan, Petoskey; and G. Kreiger, Resource Center on Domestic & Sexual Violence, Lansing. The following is a summary of their presentation.

S. McGee on Collaboration/Coordinated Response: S. McGee opened with statements commending Michigan on collaboration efforts as demonstrated by the Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan and the MCADV on confidentiality issues. Michigan has been engaged in a major public policy shift that says the responsibility for preventing violence rests not on the victim but on the community, as a whole, to intervene and put a stop to domestic violence. Partnerships must be created in the community to reduce or prevent domestic violence. In order for effective collaboration to take place within a community, the following bottom line values need to be shared among the players:

1. Safety, justice, and autonomy for the victim.
2. Accountability for the assailant.
3. Changing the practices of systems that come into contact with victims and assailants.
4. Shift the culture to be less tolerant of domestic violence.

In order for community collaborations to be effective, a strong battered women's advocacy program is needed. That speaks to the commitment of the DV board in supporting the training through domestic violence programs with STOP grant money.

S. McGee suggested to the board that "when you mandate that there are certain people at the table, you are probably mandating that we have to work together with a batterer because there are batterers in every one of our communities; and there are batterers in every police force over 25." She urged the board to allow for organizations to explain why collaboration is not working. Programs need to have the ability to say, on an individually based process, why these programs are not working.

S. Kensington on Collaboration/Coordinated Response: S. Kensington presented a case where a search order was recently issued to their shelter. Law enforcement entered their shelter because another county prosecutor believed that the Women's Center was harboring a fugitive. The episode escalated into a dangerous situation at a very rapid rate. The venue used by their collaborations to publicly humiliate the Marquette shelter was their coalition – the executive director was attacked and the organization was attacked.

The Women's Shelter is still waiting to hear when the collaborations can get together calmly and deal with damage control. What was learned by this process is:

1. They are really separate from the criminal justice system.
2. How one very powerful, influential assailant can get into the system and make things happen using partners hands to do it.
3. The coalition can be used as a venue by enemies to sabotage and undo work that has been done.

S. Kennington requested the MDVPTB members to use their powers to influence communities in the areas of contracts, law, and policy.

B. Mills on Collaboration/Coordinated Response: Why do we do what we do? Why do board people sit on a board? Why do people become directors of programs who care about this issue? Answer: We all started by being committed to trying to make a difference for people who have no allies and had no program support.

B. Mills sees the domestic violence mission as what victims face on a daily basis; what services need to be provided to meet their need. What are the goals we hold in common for this group of people and how do we reach those goals in some meaningful way? Agency directors are feeling the pressure of being expected to be experts in everything that exists which might relate to domestic violence, i.e., to be legal authorities, to understand the entire criminal justice system, to understand the medical system, to know what happens in the social service system (welfare reform, etc.). The idea of collaboration is two different agencies that come together to provide a service and work together in a different way.

B. Mills suggested the MDVPTB members consider:

1. What are we asking the programs to deliver?
2. What are we asking them to be?
3. Is it in a match with the reality of what their resources really are?
4. What expertise levels can be provided with the level of support given to staffing, training, and retention of solid staff?

M. Keefe on Resources: M. Keefe spoke on the long list of emerging issues and trends with resources coming up on top. The assets in Michigan include VAWA federal dollars, the incredible leadership of the MDVTPB, the 20+ years of domestic violence field experience of D. Cain, and a governor who is historically very supportive of domestic violence issues. The list of assets goes on and on, making Michigan stand out as a national model.

The STOP grant dissemination, being an excellent model, is not without its problems. One million dollars were carved out to do training in Michigan across the board for service providers, law enforcement, prosecutors, and judges. The remainder of the funds goes out to 46 grants in local communities based on a formula. The STOP grants have created giant

expectations with collaborating at every level, signing off, providing PPOs, etc. stretching the expectations to the maximum.

There are an incredible core of veteran directors. However, of the 46 shelters funded, there has been a 40% executive director turnover in the field over the last few years. The need for training new directors and staff in the area of middle management training and helping with personnel changes is a most important issue. With the large turnover in human resources, there will be a definite impact on quality of service without proper training.

In summary, each of the 46 programs has unique challenges, unique leadership, unique communities, unique boards they report to, and unique monetary needs (from 5% - 75% in donations). What would the solutions be?

1. Violence Against Women Act II (currently moving through Congress): Take a lead with our national allies to put more resources into essential and core services for battered women.
2. Quality Assurance: A major asset of ensuring victim services. Support the board's efforts into making sure this process is implemented.
3. Technical Assistance: That the Resource Center and training services continue to support the people in the work they do.

J. Mancinelli on Resources: J. Mancinelli's presentation focused on helping to educate the audience on resources and resource development in the programs throughout the year. Audience participation was involved by a show of hands regarding whether the needs of domestic violence shelters are still being met with 1986 comprehensive grant funds. The board was presented with the great need domestic violence shelters are experiencing and the need to raise the cap for better serving their communities.

The current cap provides basic comprehensive funds to be used for: emergency shelter, child care/children's services, health care advocacy, financial assistance, transportation, counseling, legal assistance, and 24-hour hotline. The board was again asked to be supportive of the Violence Against Women Act II package as "it is time to move ahead."

G. Krieger on Trends: Material was distributed to the board from the Michigan Resource Center on Domestic & Sexual Violence. Additional copies may be obtained from the coalition office. G. Krieger highlighted the following key issues:

1. Economic justice and housing issues.
2. Enhancing services for diverse and traditionally under-served populations.
3. Custody/civil justice.

4. Backlash - Advocacy and research issues: battered women being arrested for use of force, and interpreting research data on male vs. female perpetrators of domestic violence.
5. Emerging criminal justice issues: criminalization of child witnessing domestic violence, restorative justice, and criminalization of failure to protect children.

Discussion ensued following panel presentations. J. Fink asked what direction the board should take to assist collaboration and cooperation at the local level. What should the board be doing at this level for collaboration on the state level that would have an impact and assist the shelters.

Discussion ensued. B. Mills summarized the afternoon panel presentation and discussion by concluding:

1. Allow for diversity of what is present in reality with relation to where shelters are at their own level.
2. A boilerplate response from 46 programs is unrealistic.
3. Allow for more flexibility in the Request for Proposals.
4. There are issues of training, keeping key personnel, and holding local people accountable.
5. Shelters are burdened by over regulation and need ways to address policies, contracts, and grants.

- V. Public Comment:** The audience expressed their support for the work the board is doing and appreciates the opportunity to be heard. D. Howard, FIA Director, expressed his support and appreciation to the MDVPTB.

On behalf of BISC-MI, the MDVPTB was thanked for funding which made it possible for 28 partners to attend the BISC conference.

L. Huff of Turning Point relayed a tragic story in Macomb County which she experienced during the past week. Her telling of the story made all of aware of why they are working in the domestic violence prevention and treatment field.

- VI. Process Evaluation:** L. Hermen, Centerboard Associates, expressed his evaluation of the board meeting stating that it ran according to the Carver Model by clearly establishing intellectual and thoughtful policy. He questioned the board, “is this what you really want?”

Unanimously the board members said “yes.” Developing innovative ways to address the issues raised today will be placed on a working agenda for the June board retreat.

- VII. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.